

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the subject application prior to entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to include features of claims 2-4 in the alternative, as well as to improve upon the wording. Claims 2-4 are thus canceled. Similarly, claim 5 is amended to include features of claims 6-8 in the alternative and to improve upon the wording of the claim. Claims 6-9 are canceled. Claim 10 is amended to include features of claim 14. Claim 15 is amended similarly to claim 10. Claim 16 is a combination of features of former claims 16 and 17, with amendments made for consistency with claim 15. Similarly, claim 18 includes a combination of features of former claims 16 and 18, and claim 19 includes a combination of features of former claims 16 and 19. Claim 20 is amended similarly to claim 10. Claim 25 is amended similarly to claim 15. Claim 26 is a combination of features of former claims 26 and 27, with amendments also made for consistency. Similarly, claim 28 is based on a combination of former claims 26 and 28, with further amendments made for consistency. Claim 29 is based on a combination of former claims 26 and 29, also further amended for consistency. Claims 2-4, 6-9, 14, 17, 24 and 27 are canceled. No new matter is presented by the foregoing amendments.

Turning now to the Examiner's objections and rejections in the outstanding Action, claims 8-9 are objected to because of an informality. In particular, the Examiner alleges that these claims are duplicative. Claims 13 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC Section 112, second paragraph, because of the use of "for example." Regarding the rejections based upon art, claims 1-10, 15-20 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 USC Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Ketola et al. (US 2001/0029194). Claims 10-14 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 USC Section 102(b) as being anticipated by McCarthy (US 2002/0024540).

The foregoing objections and rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

Regarding the Examiner's objections, it is respectfully noted that claims 8-9 are canceled and the words "for example" are deleted from claims 13 and 23. Accordingly, the objections should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

It is further respectfully asserted that the cited art, whether viewed alone or in combination, does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention; nor is there a reason to modify the cited art in an attempt to arrive at the subject claims, for at least the following reasons.

US 2001/0029194 by Ketola et al. relates to reminding of an unanswered call. As is shown in Figure 4 and described in the corresponding part of the description, in an embodiment when an incoming call is received, a mobile telephone identifies the telephone number of the caller at step 42. At step 43, the user either answers the call, rejects the call or indicates that the user does not want to take the call, but instead wants a reminder. In the event that a reminder is indicated as being required at step 43, at step 46 call data is transferred into the calendar application of the mobile device. Announcement occurs either at a pre-determined reminding time or when the mobile phone's mode of operation is changed. This relates to step 50 in Figure 4, and is described in paragraph 28.

The Ketola et al. reference does not disclose Applicant's method including "determining if there is correspondence" between the telephone number of the caller and "an identifier associated with the application at the time of the application start event and relating to a device or resource address, a sub-routine or a device setting", as required by part (a) of Applicant's independent claim 1. Furthermore, the Ketola et al. reference does not disclose Applicant's method including determining if there is correspondence between the identifier forming part of the reminder item and "an identifier which relates to a device or resource address, a sub-routine or a device setting and which becomes associated with the application following the application start event and whilst the application is running on the device", as required by part (b) of claim 1. Furthermore, the Ketola et al. reference does not disclose Applicant's method determining whether there is correspondence between the identifier forming part of the reminder item and "a telephone number associated with a call handler application on or following a call handler application start event", as required by part (c) of claim 1. Lastly, this reference does not disclose Applicant's method including "controlling the device to announce the reminder item only if correspondence is present". This last step is missing from Ketola et al. at least since Ketola et al. do

not disclose determining if there is correspondence between the telephone number forming part of the reminder item and any other data, let alone any of the specific alternatives recited in claim 1.

An explanation of the advantages obtained by the features of claim 1 can be found at pages 1-2 of the application, and the Examiner is respectfully directed to these advantages.

It is respectfully asserted that the differences between Ketola et al. and claim 1 are such that a person skilled in the art would not find the invention of claim 1 to be either anticipated or obvious.

Claim 5 is an independent claim directed to a mobile communication device. This claim is also contended to be patentable over Ketola et al. for reasons set forth above.

Other independent claims are concerned with, for example, the setting-up of a reminder, in particular an application start event reminder. More particularly, claim 10 is an independent method claim allowing a user to set-up an application start event reminder on a mobile communications device. Claim 15 is an independent method claim relating to the setting up of an application start event reminder by receiving information with which to constitute the reminder. In embodiments of the invention, the information is sent from a user of another mobile device. Claim 15 relates to embodiments described, for example, with reference to Figures 5 and 6. Claims 20 and 25 are independent device claims.

Ketola et al. describe at paragraph 26 what happens when the user wants to be reminded of an unanswered call. It is described there that when selector 33 is pressed, the telephone number of the caller is transferred into the register of unanswered calls and, at the same time, the number information is transferred into the calendar for reminding. The entering of the number information is automatic; the user does not get to decide whether the telephone number is placed in the calendar, or what number is placed in the calendar. Instead, the telephone number of the caller is placed in the calendar, and the user is unable to effect any control over this process.

Thus, Ketola et al. do not disclose Applicant's method including the step of claim 10 "controlling the device to allow a user... to enter or select an identifier", neither does Ketola et al. disclose the step of claim 10 "to allow a user to initiate an application start event reminder." Consequently, Ketola et al. do not disclose Applicant's method "including the identifier as part of the reminder", "associating the reminder with the application" nor does Ketola et al. disclose "storing the reminder with an application identifier and the identifier". Consequently, the Ketola et al. reference does not anticipate nor render obvious claim 10.

For corresponding reasons at least, the other independent claims are also contended to be novel and non-obvious with respect to Ketola et al.

US 2002/0024540 (McCarthy) is then cited by the Examiner in the rejection of claims 10-14 and 20-24.

McCarthy discloses a mobile telephone in which a clock function and a reminder application are provided. The reminder application has a text window in which the user through the user interface enters a reminder text label, and a time entry window in which the user through the user interface enters a date and time for the reminder. An alert unit alerts when the clock reaches the entered time and date for the reminder. As such, McCarthy discloses what is now wholly conventional for many cellular mobile telephones. McCarthy also discloses that a reminder may be sent via a cellular network, as is described with reference to Figures 5 and 6 from paragraphs 51 to 54. However, the reminders of McCarthy are not linked to any application start event, being an event of starting an application, and do not include an identifier as part of the reminder. Consequently, McCarthy does not disclose the following features of claim 10: "controlling the device to allow a user to ... enter or select an identifier", "controlling the device to allow a user to initiate an application start event reminder", "including the identifier as part of the reminder", "associating the reminder with the application" nor "storing the reminder with an application indicator and the identifier in a memory". Thus, McCarthy is not relevant to claim 10.

The differences between McCarthy and claim 10 are such that it does not seem to be reasonable to allege that the person skilled in the art would find the invention of claim 10 to be anticipated or obvious in view of this reference.

For corresponding reasons at least, the other independent claims are also contended to be novel and non-obvious with respect to the cited art.

The other claims are contended to be patentable by virtue of their dependency on a patentable independent claim.

All issues having been addressed, the subject application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration that results in the allowance of all of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine Wilkes Beninati

Christine Wilkes Beninati

Reg. No.: 37,967

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203) 925-9400

Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

March 5, 2008

Date

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

3-5-08
Date

Anne Orenstein
Name of Person Making Deposit